



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine.

---

---

VOL XV.

JANUARY, 1914.

No. 1.

---

---

## THE BARONIES OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

By Henry A. M. Smith.

---

### XI.

#### RAPHOE BARONY.

On the 16 August, 1698, John Bayley Esq., of Ballinacough, in the County of Tipperary, Ireland, by a patent of that date, was by the Lords Proprietors of Carolina created a Landgrave.<sup>1</sup> The entry in the minutes is "John Bayley Esq. had another Patent for Landgrave granted him being dated y<sup>e</sup> 16 of August, 1698, for which he is to pay "£100.0.0 in Ireland."<sup>2</sup>

This is the first mention of John Bayley in that connection and it does not appear for what service or position the dignity of Landgrave was bestowed upon him. The £100. was not for the dignity which under the fundamental Constitutions was not purchasable and does not appear ever by the Proprietors to have been sold, but was in consideration of the reduced rent at which at that date the Proprietors issued the grants to lands at a quit rent thereon. The name is subsequently variously spelt in the old records, viz:

---

<sup>1</sup>Off: Hist: Com: Book N. C., p. 333.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid, London MSS. vol. 4, p. 70. His patent as Landgrave in Latin is recorded in Bk. Q. Q., 1685-1712, p. 321.

Bayley, Bayly, Bailey and Bailly. The correct spelling seems to have been Bayley, as used in his patent, although the form Bailey is the more common.

The original John Bayley, so far as the record discloses, does not appear to have come to Carolina to take out the lands to which he was entitled under his landgrave's patent. On his death his landgraveship descended to his son and heir of the same name. This last also does not appear to have come to Carolina, but on 9<sup>th</sup> November, 1722, he executed a power of attorney to one Alexander Trench of Charles Town<sup>3</sup> empowering the latter to take possession of and sell and dispose of the lands in Carolina to which the former was entitled under the patent issued to his father.

Trench, if not then living in Charles Town, seems to have soon proceeded there and arranged to have surveyed out and to dispose of the lands. The method pursued by him in so doing seems to have been unique as practiced by him and by the second Landgrave, Bellinger. The patent as Landgrave entitled the holder to four baronies of 12,000 acres each, or 48,000 acres in all. The course pursued under the instructions of the Proprietors from the settlement of the colony was that in all such cases an application was to be made for a grant and a specific grant made before the applicant became entitled to the land, i.e. the party holding a patent, or receipt, or certificate, entitling him to a grant made application to the council for a grant. Thereupon a warrant was issued to the Surveyor General to survey for the applicant out of land not already granted the acreage for which he applied. The Surveyor General having surveyed the land made a plat with his certificate of survey annexed and a grant was then issued to the applicant by the Governor and the deputies of the Proprietors for the land described in the plat and certificate.

Copies of the plat and certificate were kept in the records of the Surveyor General's office.

Alexander Trench does not seem to have followed this course. He would have a parcel of land surveyed out for an intending purchaser from him and then

---

<sup>3</sup>M. C. O. Charleston, Bk. D., p. 163.

annex the plat to a deed of conveyance direct from himself as attorney for John Bayley to the purchaser as made for land to which Bayley was entitled under his patent. No direct grant from the Lords Proprietors would thus appear for that specific parcel of land.

Trench probably returned copies of all plats surveyed for him to the Surveyor General's office so as to keep the record and prevent double grants of the same land. As most of the old records of such plats prior to 1732 have apparently been destroyed—at least they are not to be found among the State records in Columbia—it cannot be ascertained definitely whether Trench did so or not; but as copies of a number of the plats made for him in this way are scattered throughout some of the old record books, it would appear probable that he did.

The consequence has been that titles originating from John Bayley cannot be traced back to a definite grant. They commence with a deed of conveyance from Trench, as Attorney for Bayley, and not being listed or indexed as granted, it is most difficult at times to go back to the first holder. The only other case in which to the ascertainment of this writer the same course was followed to any extent is that of Landgrave Edmund Bellinger with this difference, that Landgrave Bellinger seems to have had the lands surveyed out and platted for himself and in his own name, whereas in the majority of cases Trench would apparently bargain off so much land to a third person, have it surveyed and then convey the land surveyed to the party.

Exactly, therefore, when the Raphoe Barony was surveyed out cannot be ascertained.

There is no grant for it on record. The plats of the date at which it was probably laid out are not now to be found in Columbia. The writer has seen a copy of an old plat, apparently in the handwriting of Joseph Purcell, a surveyor of excellent standing in the low country at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. This plat is described as "Copy of a plan of Raphoe Barony on Santee River from a plat on parchment taken June 1803" and is endorsed "Plan of Raphoe Barony belonging to John Baylie Landgrave." It is a matter of speculation whether the

name Raphoe is of Indian origin. The ending "e" or "oe" would so indicate, but it may be after some Irish or other locality.

The plat annexed to this article is made from the old copy plat above referred to.

The record does not disclose any transfer of this Barony from John Bayley. Trench died about 1731 or 1732, or in that neighbourhood.

After Trench's death the Barony seems to have been abandoned. At least no transfer or disposition of it can be found on the record by John Bayley or any one claiming under him.

Previous to the laying out of the Barony the land to the West had been granted. On 15 September, 1705<sup>4</sup> there had been issued to John Strode (or Stroud) three grants for 400 acres each, all adjacent and situate on the South side of the Santee river, forming a solid body of land of 1,200 acres. On the easternmost of these grants was the large spring, then and ever since known as "Eutaw Springs." On the old plat it is spelt "Hutaw." Strode was the son of a John Strode of Barbadoes, who had taken an interested part in the settlement of the Province. As early as 1695 a grant for 500 acres<sup>5</sup> had been made to John Strode on a swamp or stream flowing into the head of Appee Bee or Fosters creek. To that he had added by grant and purchase until he had acquired an estate of about 1,600 acres. Strode seems to have died in the province, leaving a widow, Susannah, who later, certainly during or prior to 1712, married the Honorable James Kinloch, son of Sir Francis Kinloch Bart: of Gilmerton in East Lothian, Scotland. Through proceedings for the settlement of Strode's estate the lands near Fosters' creek as well as those on Santee river passed to James Kinloch, who on 26 Decr, 1749,<sup>6</sup> conveyed 200 acres, the Southern half of the Easternmost grant of 400 acres, to Margaret O'Neal. Upon the part so conveyed was the Eutaw Spring. The tract conveyed is described as bounding Southeast and Northeast on lands laid out to "Land-

---

<sup>4</sup>Off: Secy. State, Grant Bk. 35, p. 480.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid, p. 163.

<sup>6</sup>M. C. O. Charleston, Bk. G. G., p. 27.

grave Trench." The remaining 1,000 acres of the Strode grants, James Kinloch, on 5 February, 1750, conveyed to his son, Francis Kinloch, who on 2 December, 1756, conveyed the remaining 200 acres of the Easternmost Strode grant (the part fronting on the river) to George Austin.<sup>7</sup>

In the deed it is recited that James Kinloch had become entitled to the 1,200 acres, which was bounded East and South by "Trench's Barony called Raphoe or vacant land," and this is the only other mention of the name "Raphoe" on the record that the writer has found. The 200 acres conveyed is described as bounding Northeast "on Trench's "Barony or vacant land."

On 4 May, 1757,<sup>8</sup> Francis Kinloch conveyed the remaining 800 acres to Thomas Lynch and on 19 April, 1769, Thomas Lynch and Isaac Motte J<sup>r</sup> conveyed the 800 acres to Peter Sinkler and James Sinkler. The name of "Belvidere" was given to this tract of 800 acres at a very early date, whether during the ownership of the Kinlochs, Lynch, or the Sinklers, the record does not disclose, but this name it has ever since retained, and the tract has also since remained, as it still does, in the Sinkler family.

During this period the Barony seems to have lain as it were abandoned. In the last deeds of Francis Kinloch it is described as "or vacant land" and new grants were issued for parts of it. As early as 1747 Margaret O'Neal had obtained a grant for 100 acres (afterwards called the Plum Patch) within the Barony lines. Margaret O'Neal, who was the widow of Charles O'Neal, afterwards (in 1753), married James McKelvey,<sup>9</sup> and James McKelvey took out a number of grants, many of which were for land within the Barony lines. According to certain affidavits on the record<sup>10</sup> both James McKelvey and Margaret O'Neal (who was also born McKelvey) were from a place called Brackey in the Parish of Fermon Magurk in the Barony of Omagh, County Tyrone, Ireland. One of the plantations owned by McKelvey was called Brackey. A number of grants within

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid, Bk. B. B., 501.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid, Bk. W. 5, p. 83.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid, Bk. I. No. 7, p. 386.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid, C. No. 6, p. 381.

the Barony lines were taken out by others, too numerous for recapitulation, and by 1775 the entire area seems to have been regranted. Francis Kinloch, on 22 Novr., 1760, received a grant within the Barony for 1,000 acres, at a place known as Dawshee or Dorchee, immediately adjacent to the East to the Strode grants, which he subsequently transferred to Tacitus Gaillard.<sup>11</sup>

The name Raphoe seems to have disappeared, and as many of the new grants included land both within and without the Barony the lines of the Barony as distinctive recognizable lines were disregarded. Exactly what plantations afterwards occupied the area of the Barony it is impossible for the writer to say without more maps than he has found upon the record. Beginning at the line between the Barony and the Eutaw Springs tract and going East, the first plantation on the river was Brackey, on a part of the Francis Kinloch 1,000 acre grant. It belonged for a long time to the McKelvey's, from whom no doubt it received the name. Then followed Dawshee or Dorchee, which seems to have been subdivided into three, viz: Black Jack, Old Dawshee, and New or Little Dawshee. Then came Walnut Grove, a plantation at one time owned by Gabriel Marion and by him devised to his son, Benjamin Marion,<sup>12</sup> and which was afterwards acquired by Capt. Peter Gaillard of the "Rocks" who transferred it to his son, James Gaillard. Then followed "Pond Bluff," the plantation owned by General Francis Marion of the Revolution. To what extent (if at all) the next plantation, "Black Branch," was within the lines the writer cannot indicate. So as to the plantations lying away from the river, the following seem to have been within the Barony lines, viz: Belmont, Blue Hole, Lime-spring, New Mercia, Brush Pond, and Ash Hill. Possibly a portion of "The Rocks," the plantation of Capt. Peter Gaillard of the Revolution was also in part within the Barony, and so also as to "Walworth" plantation. The change of ownership and change of name of much of this property seems to have been quite constant, altho up to 1860

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid. D. No. 3, p. 728.

<sup>12</sup>Prob: Ct. Charleston, Will dated 29 Febr., 1776.

the land was owned by practically the descendants of the same group of families.

The road to the "Congarees" on the old map called the "Charichy" (Cherokee) path ran directly across the Barony to the ferry known as Nelson's ferry, over which the trade to the interior, to the Northwest, passed. It was during the war of the Revolution the highway for the passage of the armed forces of both sides, and it was at the Eutaw Springs (on the Strode grant), near this road, that was fought, in 1781, the battle of Eutaw Springs, which although tactically a repulse to General Greene and the American Army, yet practically ended all British occupation of South Carolina outside of the City of Charleston and its environs. The land within the Barony apparently was excellent and with the cultivation of cotton the section attained to a high degree of material prosperity. As was the case with the rest of the low country of South Carolina the consequence of the war of 1861-1865 was to destroy all this. The accumulations of years of labour were swept away. The whole economic system on which the industry of the country was based was changed and the result has been that the same complete change in the ownership and occupation of the land has taken place.

## XII.

### THE TOMOTLEY BARONY.

Tomotly, Tomotlee, Timotly, Timotlee, as it is variably spelt, was the name apparently of Indian origin of a locality in Granville (now Beaufort) County. It was in the lands occupied by the Yemassee Indians. After the expulsion of those Indians, consequent upon the Yemassee war of 1715, those lands known as the Yemassee lands became open to settlement.

Edmund Bellinger appears in the Province as early as 1692. He is called "Captain" Edmund Bellinger, possibly was a ship captain, but at any rate stood well with the Lords Proprietors, was in 1697 the deputy of Lord Craven, in 1698



was appointed Surveyor General and was a member of the Grand Council.

In 1698 he assisted the Proprietors in drawing up the fifth (and last) set of Fundamental Constitutions proposed for the government of the Province.<sup>1</sup>

By a patent dated 7 May, 1698, he was created a Landgrave. The memorandum on minute is "Capt. Edmund Bellinger had a patent for Landgrave Granted him, being "dated y<sup>e</sup> 7<sup>th</sup> of May, 1698, for which he is to pay £100. in "Carolina."<sup>2</sup>

This £100. was not as has been erroneously stated in payment for this dignity of Landgrave. That dignity was by the Fundamental Constitutions not purchasable, and so far as this writer knows there is no instance in which it was by the Lords Proprietors attempted to be sold.

It was paid "as a consideration for reducing the rent of "their Lands to ten shillings for one thousand acres."<sup>3</sup>

Under this patent a barony containing 13,000 acres was laid out in the Yemassee lands and included the savannah or swamp known by the name of Tomotley. When the barony was run out the record does not disclose. It would appear that Edmund Bellinger (both the first and the second Landgrave of that name) followed the plan that has been described in the account of the Raphoe barony as pursued by Alexander Trench, of having the land run out directly under the patent, without applying for any further specific grant therefor.

The first Landgrave died, leaving a will dated 10 October, 1705, whereby he devised all the lands under his patent to his son Thomas, upon whose death the lands descended to his brother, the second Landgrave, Edmund Bellinger.<sup>4</sup> The latter in his memorial dated 22 May, 1733,<sup>5</sup> states the whole 13,000 acres as then in a body and as having descended to him from his brother, Thomas. It is thus possible that the 13,000 acres may have been run out by the first Landgrave. The record does not show when the first Landgrave died.

---

<sup>1</sup>Collec<sup>n</sup>. Hist: Soc: S. C., vol. 1, p. 145.

<sup>2</sup>Off: Hist: Com<sup>n</sup>. S. C., London MSS., vol. 4, p. 70.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid, p. 45.

<sup>4</sup>Off: Hist Comm: Memo Bk. 3, p. 137.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

His will is stated to have been dated in 1705. It is not likely that the Barony was run out until after the Yemassee war, and thus unless the first Landgrave lived until that date the Barony was run out under his patent but by either his son, Thomas, or his son, Edmund, most likely the last. (M. C. O. Charleston, Bk. B. B., p. 71.)

The second Landgrave died in 1739, leaving a will stated in the deeds to have been dated 21 Febry, 1739, but which is not now to be found on the record. He left a widow, Elizabeth, the daughter of Shem Butler, and according to a memorial or list filed by her 17 July, 1747,<sup>6</sup> the barony or 13,000 acres had been disposed of by that time, as follows:

- 500 acres to Edmund Bellinger.
- 1,000 acres to Edmund Bellinger, J<sup>r</sup>.
- 1,000 acres to George Bellinger.
- 500 acres to Hon. Charles Pinckney.
- 500 acres to William Elliott.
- 2,000 acres to Henry Hyrne.
- 1,000 acres to Burnaby Bull.
- 1,000 acres to William Bellinger.
- 1,000 acres to M<sup>rs</sup>. Eliz. Bellinger, his widow.
- 1,000 acres to Elizabeth Bellinger, his daughter.
- 1,000 acres to William Bellinger, J<sup>r</sup>.
- 1,000 acres to daughter, Mary Bellinger.
- 50 acres to Church Commissioners for the purpose of a Church.
- 887 acres to Thomas Butler.

---

12,437

This seems however to be in conflict with other deeds on the record.

On 25 July, 1744,<sup>7</sup> Elizabeth Bellinger, Widow and Executrix of Landgrave Bellinger, by authority conferred in his Will conveyed to James Deveau 906 acres on "Tomotly Savannah." This 906 acres, James Deveau, on 25 January, 1755,<sup>8</sup> conveyed to Ralph Izard, the grandson of Walter

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid, Memo Bk. 7, p. 481.

<sup>7</sup>M. C. O. Charleston, Book A. A., p. 174.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid, Bk. F. F., p. 366.

Izard, the son of Ralph Izard, the immigrant.<sup>9</sup> Ralph Izard died in February, 1761, leaving the Tomotley plantation to his son, Walter, who at his death in 1788 left it to his brother, Ralph.<sup>10</sup> On the death of this last Ralph Izard, intestate, and the division of his estate, the Tomotley plantation was allotted in 1813 to his daughter, Patience W. B. Izard, afterwards M<sup>rs</sup>. Eustis,<sup>11</sup> who died in 1860 still possessed of it. So that the Tomotley plantation as part of the old barony had been in the Izard family from 1755 to 1860, and in the two families of Bellinger and Izard (save for the 10 years it was held by James Deveau) from the time it was first laid out until M<sup>rs</sup>. Eustis' death.

The writer has never found any map of the complete barony of 13,000 acres, nor any collection of maps of adjoining places sufficient to reconstitute the old lines of the barony. The Tomotley plantation was certainly part of it and Sheldon Church appears also to be on the 50 acres part of the barony given or conveyed for the purpose. The house on the Tomotley plantation was destroyed in 1865 by Sherman's invading army. There still remains the old grove of live oaks, one of the finest in the low country of South Carolina.

### XIII.

#### MALLING BARONY.

This so-called barony was really not a barony under the definition of what constituted a barony in South Carolina as explained in the first of these articles on the Baronies of South Carolina.<sup>1</sup> It did not contain 12,000 acres nor was it granted to a Proprietor, a Landgrave, or a Cassique. In the case of Boon's Barony, described in a previous number of this Magazine,<sup>2</sup> the grant altho' less than 12,000 acres was to a Cassique.

---

<sup>9</sup>S. C. Hist: & Gen: Mag: vol. 2, p. 233.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid, p. 234.

<sup>11</sup>S. C. Hist. & Gen. Mag., vol. 2, p. 237.

<sup>1</sup>Hist: & Geneal: Mag: of S. C., vol. XI, p. 75.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid, vol. 13, p. 71.

In the present case it was called a barony simply because it was owned by one who seemed to be regarded as a person of such distinction that his holding was styled erroneously a barony.

On September 15, 1705<sup>3</sup> there was granted to Jean or John Boisseau a tract of 2,700 acres lying to the Northeast of the grant of 1,800 acres to John Stevens or the settlers of Dorchester.<sup>4</sup> John Boisseau dying thereafter was survived by his widow, Mary Boisseau, who, about April, 1711, married James Gignilliat "Clarke."<sup>5</sup> What relation this James Gignilliat bore (if any) to Jean François Gignilliat, the first Swiss to settle in the Province, the writer has never been able to ascertain. From his profession "Clarke" he likely was the minister to the French Huguenot settlement in Goose Creek, of which John Boisseau was one and whose grants and settlements lay near this Boisseau grant.

Boisseau's lands seem to have passed by will to his widow, for after her marriage to Gignilliat her husband and herself proceeded to dispose of and convey the lands. From this tract of 2,700 acres a subdivision of 831 acres was conveyed by James and Mary Gignilliat to Jonathan Fitch and on 25 March, 1716, this tract of 831 acres was by Jonathan Fitch and Ann his wife conveyed to Elizabeth Barrington.<sup>6</sup>

Who Elizabeth Barrington was or what her connection with S<sup>r</sup>. Hovenden Walker does not appear on the record, but on the 4 April, 1716, she executed a declaration stating that this tract of 831 acres (together with another tract of 210 acres formerly a separate grant to John Boisseau also conveyed to her by Fitch and wife), had been purchased with the money of S<sup>r</sup>. Hovenden Walker and that her name was only used in trust for S<sup>r</sup>. Hovenden Walker to whom all the land so purchased belonged.<sup>7</sup>

S<sup>r</sup>. Hovenden Walker had had a distinguished career in the English Navy; according to the Dictionary of National

---

<sup>3</sup>Off: Secy of State Grants, vol. 38, p. 507.

<sup>4</sup>S. C. Hist: & Geneal: Mag: vol. 6, p. 70.

<sup>5</sup>Off. Hist. Com<sup>n</sup>., Bk. 1701-1714, p. 161.

<sup>6</sup>Off. Hist. Com<sup>n</sup>. Bk. 1714-1717, p. 199.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

Biography he was born about 1656, the son of Col. William Walker, of Tankardstown, Queen's County, Ireland, and having entered the navy was captain in 1691, and held successive commands in active service. He was at the battle of Barfleur and in 1696, as Captain of the *Finesight* of 50 guns he beat off two French ships of 60 and 70 guns. In 1698 he was flag captain in the Mediterranean expedition, with local rank as Admiral, and in March, 1710/11 he was made Rear-Admiral of the White, Knighted, and placed in command of the Naval expedition against Quebec. In 1711-12 he was commander-in-chief at Jamaica. His biography adds that "about 1715 in disgust left the country and settled in South Carolina."

The record above cited shows when and where he settled. The tract of 831 acres on which he seems to have lived and which was known as his "barony" is about three miles from the present town of Summerville, between that town and the station on the Southern Railway known as "Ladsons."

According to the dates he must have settled in the Province just about the close of the Yemassee war of 1715, and seems to have at once "stood upon his rights and privileges" as he considered himself entitled to them.

The following notice or proclamation and letter are spread on the records of the time. The explanation would appear to be that either S<sup>r</sup>. Hovenden or some employee of his had been called on for some military service under the law of the day in the Province, and that a horse of his had been seized, either to enforce the service or in payment of some fine imposed for failure to perform it.

"By The hon<sup>ble</sup>: Robert Johnson Esq<sup>r</sup>. Govern<sup>r</sup>. Capt Generall admirall & Comand<sup>r</sup> In Chief In y<sup>e</sup> Province of South Carolina.

Whereas S<sup>r</sup>. Hovenden Walker of Malling Plantation In South Carolina Kn<sup>t</sup>. having Served Two Hole Warrs at Sea in the Reigns of King William & Queen Mary and Queen Anne and in That Service Arriving to the honour of

being Rear admirall of the White Squadron of the Royall Navy and at Two Severall Times Comanding in Chiefe In America with the Union Flagg at Maintopmast head as well as being a Brother of Trinity house of Deptford Stroud had thereby the Right and Privilege in Great Britain of being Exempt from providing or bearing Armour or to be Taxed or Contribute unto the Charge Thereof and from doing and Contributing to any Manner of Land Service Whatever then as a mariner and Seaman in Sea Service as also from being Sumoned or Put in assizes Jurys Inquests attaints or other Recognizances whatever.

Therefore that the Said S<sup>r</sup>. Hovenden Walker may have No Just reason to Complain that upon his Settling here in S<sup>o</sup>. Carolina any of those his bove Said Long Enjoyed rights and Priviledges are in any Wise Invaded or Taken from him Notice is hereby Given to all Judges, Magistrates officers Civill and military Generall & Field officers and all others whom it may Concerne that the said S<sup>r</sup>. Hovenden Walker nither himself his overseer or other white Servants in his Wages or bought for Term of Years Shall be Summoned or obliged to appear at any Muster or alarm whatsoever and he and they are Hereby Excepted from the Same.

Given und<sup>r</sup>: my hand and Seal at Armes this 23<sup>d</sup> day of  
June Anno Dom: 1718

Rob<sup>t</sup>. Johnson”<sup>8</sup>

“Hon<sup>d</sup>. S<sup>r</sup>.

As to Those Particular Priviledges You have Desired of me to Grant you Both in relation to your Quality and as a Member of Trinity-house I have Laid the Same before The Councill and They have readily Consented to the Same and have ordered the Same to be Engrossed and Will Take the first oppertunity to Transmitt it to You.

If you Please to Send to Nathaniel Riscoe and Demand your Horse of him Probably he will Consider of the Same

---

<sup>8</sup>Off. Hist. Com<sup>n</sup>., Bk. 1714-1717, p. 202.

and give you no further Trouble otherwise You may Put  
my Warr<sup>t</sup>. in Force and I Shall do you Justice who am  
Hon<sup>d</sup>. S<sup>r</sup>.

Your humble Servant  
Rob<sup>t</sup>. Johnson

From my Plantation

June the 25<sup>th</sup> 1718

To S<sup>r</sup>. Hovenden Walker  
at his Plantation. These.”

S<sup>r</sup>. Hovenden Walker took an active part in the overthrow of the Proprietary government in 1719. He was present and participated in the armed demonstration against the government and was made President of the Revolutionary Council. He soon ceased to act with the Council, for what reason the record does not disclose, and retired to his plantation and seems to have soon after left the Province. On 12 April, 1720, he made a power of attorney to Robert Howes, D<sup>r</sup>. James Cavanagh and Henry Houser, authorizing them to sell all his hands and personal property in South Carolina, and presumably that was about the date of his departure; altho there is on record the evidence of the transfer to him on 28<sup>th</sup> June, 1720, from Jonathan and Anne Fitch of a tract of 519 acres (another part of the Boisseau 2,700 acre grant).

Nothing seems to have been done with the so called “Barony” tract of 831 acres, at least no transfer from S<sup>r</sup>. Hovenden appears on the record; and on 19 November, 1772, new grants were issued covering the tract as vacant land. One grant was to Charles Cantey for 400<sup>10</sup> acres and the other to Richard Saltus for 400 acres.<sup>11</sup>

The grants do not recite that they are for land formerly occupied by S<sup>r</sup>. Hovenden Walker, but a comparison of the boundaries and acreage shows that they could not have covered any other land save that.

The part granted to Richard Saltus was by him devised to his daughter, Elizabeth,<sup>12</sup> afterwards Elizabeth Prevaux

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

<sup>10</sup>Off. Sec. of State, Royal Grants, vol. 27, p. 234.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid, p. 262.

<sup>12</sup>Prob. Ct. Charleston, Will Bk. 1771-1774, p. 358.

and was in 1820 conveyed by Christopher G. Hasell (through what connection with Elizabeth Prevaux the deed does not show) to D<sup>r</sup>. Cornelius Dupont,<sup>13</sup> by whose executors it was in 1844 conveyed to the late Dr. William Moultrie Brailsford and formed part of his plantation near Summerville.<sup>14</sup>

The Charles Cantey to whom the other 400 acres was granted was apparently Charles Cantey of St. Stephens or "Mattasee."<sup>15</sup> At least this tract was, by three of his grand-daughters, M<sup>rs</sup>. Harriett Lequeux, Martha DuBose and Sarah Ioor (all daughters of Harriet Cantey, who married Richard Walter<sup>16</sup>) on 28 May, 1817, transferred to Lewis Poppenheim.<sup>17</sup>

There is nothing to show what reclamation and cultivation was done by S<sup>r</sup>. Hovenden Walker. Nothing to point out where his house and settlement stood. There is at one point the evidence of a former settlement—a pile of crumbling bricks and the new growth that takes possession of abandoned sites—but the space of time between its abandonment in 1720 and its examination by the present writer, say about 1890, is such as to preclude even a fair guess as its original settlement.

The map attached is from the maps attached to the grants to Saltus and Cantey, compared with maps of adjoining tracts and verified by the personal observation of the writer.

---

<sup>13</sup>M. C. O. Charleston, Bk. G. 9, p. 136.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid, Bk. M. No. 11, p. 207.

<sup>15</sup>S. C. Hist. & Gen. Mag: vol. XI, p. 221.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid, p. 236.

<sup>17</sup>M. C. O. Charleston, Bk. V. 8, pp. 258, 260.